

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/928,266	SOLINAS, JEROME ANTHONY	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tamara Teslovich	2137	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Pending

 (1) Tamara Teslovich.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Robert D. Morelli.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 12 January 2005
**Time:** 1:30 pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-5

Prior art documents discussed:

 D. Johnson and A. Menezes. *The Elliptic Curve Digital Signature Algorithm*. 23 August 1999.

 J. Solinas. *Generalized Mersenne Numbers*. 1999.

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

01.11.05 --

Application was in condition for allowance but for a few minor informalities. Examiner discussed claim objections with Attorney Morelli who agreed to confer with applicant and fax a marked-up copy of Specifications, Claims, and Figures citing all changes, as well as a clean copy of each of the abovementioned sections to be included with Examiner's amendment. Examiner Teslovich also asked Attorney Morelli about Johnson-Menezes paper citing applicant's work from August 23, 1999 suggesting that applicant had in fact presented his paper to the public more than a year before he had applied for a patent.

01.12.05 --

Attorney Morelli spoke with applicant and faxed examiner a copy of Johnson-Menezes paper citing applicant's paper as a 'preprint' and an explanation as to how Johnson-Menezes procured a copy of the paper. According to Morelli, Menezes was actually applicant's mentor at the University of Waterloo as well as head of the Math Department and had been given a copy of the paper in confidence for purposes of pre-examination before print and for advice, and that the paper had not in fact been sold or used by the public before September 1999. Attorney Morelli also faxed Examiner Teslovich a preliminary copy of amendments to be made to claims.

01.12.05 --

Examiner Teslovich spoke with Attorney Morelli again citing additional objections to claims and typographical errors.

01.13.05 --

Attorney Morelli faxed examiner 2 copies of Claims, Specifications, and Figures (one marked in accordance with 1.121 and one clean copy).

01.14.05 --

Examiner Teslovich spoke with Attorney Morelli concerning new typographical errors and suggestions for amending claims. Examiner Teslovich also suggested that Attorney Morelli speak with Applicant concerning changes to make sure that invention is not altered from original intentions.

01.20.05 --

Examiner Teslovich receives amended claims, specifications, and figures in accordance with all regulations from Attorney Morelli.